

Mechanism for Magnetic Flux Generation in Grain Boundaries of $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-x}$

M. B. Walker

Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1A7, Canada

(February 1, 2008)

The spontaneously generated magnetic flux observed by Mannhart *et. al.* (1996) in asymmetric 45° grain boundaries in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-x}$ was explained by them in terms of a $d_{x^2-y^2}$ superconducting order parameter and grain boundary faceting. This article argues that twin boundaries which contact the grain boundary also play an important role.

74.20.De,74.50.+r,74.72.Bk,74.62.Bf

INTRODUCTION

Recently Mannhart *et. al.* [1] and Moler *et. al.* [2] have observed spontaneously generated delocalized magnetic flux in what they call asymmetric 45° grain boundaries in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-x}$ (YBCO). They have explained the existence of this flux in terms of a superconducting order parameter having $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry and grain boundaries which are faceted. The geometry of their experiment and of their explanation is indicated in Fig. 1. In the words of Ref. [2], “For a d -wave superconductor, a lobe of the order parameter is normal to the boundary on one side, while a node is normal on the other. Faceting of the grain boundary produces slight variations of the grain boundary angle, rocking the local normal from the positive lobe to the negative lobe, varying the local critical current from positive to negative, producing a series of 0 and π -junctions and spontaneous magnetization.” Ref. [1] notes that the variation of the magnetic flux along the grain boundary is described by the equation [3,4]

$$\lambda_J^2 \frac{d^2 \gamma(y)}{dy^2} = \sin[\gamma(y) - \alpha(y)] \quad (1)$$

where y is the distance measured along the grain boundary, $\gamma(y)$ is the gauge-invariant phase difference across the boundary at point y , and λ_J is the Josephson penetration depth. The idea that the variations of the grain boundary angle cause the local critical current to vary from positive to negative is incorporated into this equation by taking $\alpha(y)$ to be zero when the critical current is positive, and π where the critical current is negative. The flux in the grain boundary, integrated from one end of the grain boundary up to the point y , is given by $\Phi(y) = \Phi_0 \gamma(y)/2\pi$ where the Φ_0 is the elementary flux quantum. In a realistic model of a grain boundary, λ_J would be a function of y (as in Ref. [1]) but this dependence is neglected in the present article.

The purpose of this article is to present an alternative physical model which also leads to spontaneous flux generation in asymmetric 45° twin boundaries, and which could thus also account for the experimentally observed behavior. In this alternative model, which also leads to Eq. 1, the changes of $\alpha(y)$ from 0 to π occur where twin boundaries from one side of the grain boundary contact the grain boundary (twin boundaries on the other side of the grain boundary do not cause $\alpha(y)$ to change). The details of how this twin-boundary mechanism works depend on the fact that YBCO is orthorhombic, and also on the assumption that the twin boundaries in YBCO have odd reflection symmetry (*e.g.* see Refs. [5,6]). The essential idea is that, given these assumptions, the point $y = 0$ of Fig. 2(a) can be viewed as a meeting point of three Josephson junctions, an odd number of which must be π junctions. Under these circumstances, it is known from the work of Refs. [7–9] that the superconducting ground state will have a vortex containing a flux $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ at the meeting point of the junctions.

TWIN BOUNDARY MECHANISM

Consider the situation shown in Fig. 2(a). On the left side of the grain boundary there are two distinct twins separated by a twin boundary and characterized by their Ginzburg-Landau order parameters ψ_1 and ψ_2 , respectively; the superconductor on the right side of the grain boundary is characterized by the order parameter ψ_0 . In a Ginzburg-Landau model for the grain boundary, the relevant contribution to the superconducting free energy per unit area of the grain boundary is

$$f_{>} = C \text{Re}(\psi_2 \psi_0^*) \quad (2)$$

for points y on the positive y axis, and

$$f_{<} = D \text{Re}(\psi_1 \psi_0^*) \quad (3)$$

for points on the negative y axis (*e. g.* see Ref. [10]). Now consider a new state obtained by reflecting the sample of Fig. 2(a) in a plane normal to the plane of the figure and containing the twin boundary. Assuming that the YBCO superconducting order parameter is of the A_{1g} (or $ux^2 + vy^2$) orthorhombic symmetry type (*e. g.* see Refs. [5,6]), the new order parameters are related to the old by $\psi_1^{new} = \psi_2$, $\psi_2^{new} = \psi_1$ and $\psi_0^{new} = \psi_0$. Since the total free energy is unchanged by such a reflection, $C = D$ in Eqs. 2 and 3.

The interpretation [5,6] of Josephson experiments [11–14] on twinned crystals has shown that the superconducting state of YBCO has odd symmetry with respect to a reflection in a twin boundary, *i. e.* that $\psi_2 = -\psi_1$. The argument is as follows. In Ref. [10] it is shown that the superconducting order parameter can either be continuous or change sign at a twin boundary; for YBCO these two cases correspond to the superconducting state having either even or odd symmetry with respect to a reflection in the twin boundary. Now, Josephson experiments on twinned crystals determine what is called the macroscopic symmetry of the superconducting state of the twinned crystal (which is different from the microscopic symmetry of the superconducting state of a single twin). It can be shown that, if the twin boundaries have even reflection symmetry, the macroscopic symmetry of the superconducting state of the twinned crystal is that of a tetragonal s-wave superconductor. On the other hand, if the twin boundaries have odd reflection symmetry, the macroscopic symmetry is that of a tetragonal $d_{x^2-y^2}$ superconductor. Since the Josephson experiments on twinned crystals [11–14] show macroscopic $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry, the superconducting twin boundaries must have odd reflection symmetry. Further details of this argument can be found in [5,6].

A twin boundary at which the superconducting state has odd reflection symmetry (*i.e.* for which $\psi_1 = -\psi_2$) can be viewed as a π Josephson junction (a π junction because of the change of sign of the order parameter there) with a very high critical current density. Because of the very high value of the critical current density (which is much greater than the current densities occurring in the superconductor) the phase difference of the order parameter across the junction is always locked to π .

Now note that the point $y = 0$ in Fig. 2(a) can be viewed as the meeting point of three Josephson junctions. Because $C = D$ in Eqs. 2 and 3 the grain boundary Josephson junctions along $y > 0$ and $y < 0$ are either both normal junctions or both π junctions. Also, as discussed above, since $\psi_2 = -\psi_1$ along the twin boundary, the twin boundary can be viewed as a π junction. Clearly, an odd number of π junctions converge at the meeting point. Thus, the stable superconducting ground state will contain a vortex with flux $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ at the point $y = 0$ in agreement with the arguments and experimental observations of [8] and [9].

As noted in Ref. [15], the designation of a Josephson junction as a normal junction or a π junction is a matter of convention (the total number of π junctions which meet at a point is however fixed). In the above, the given transformation properties of the order parameter under a reflection in the twin boundary are what imposed the particular convention adopted. If the substitution $\psi_2 = -\psi_2$ is made, then the twin boundary will become a normal junction and the grain boundary junction for $y > 0$ will become a π junction. Note that this substitution produces an extra minus sign in Eq. 2; it is this additional minus sign that leads to $\alpha(y) = \pi$ for $y > 0$ in Eq. 1, while $\alpha(y) = 0$ for $y < 0$.

It is also important to note that twin boundaries on the other side of the grain boundary, as in Fig. 2(b), are not expected to lead to variations of $\alpha(y)$. As above, the superconducting free energy per unit area of the grain boundary above and below the point zero can be written

$$f_{>} = A \text{Re}(\psi_2 \psi_0^*) , \quad (4)$$

and

$$f_{<} = B \text{Re}(\psi_1 \psi_0^*) . \quad (5)$$

The assumption that the superconductivity of YBCO is predominantly of the type $d_{x^2-y^2}$ implies that A and B have opposite signs. In addition, for the reasons stated above, $\psi_2 = -\psi_1$. The combination of these two sign changes means that there will be no effect on the net contribution to $\alpha(y)$ when crossing a twin boundary of the type indicated in Fig. 2(b).

The arguments just given show that the superconducting grain boundary free energy can be written

$$F = -\frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi c} j_c L \int dy \left[\frac{1}{2} \lambda_J^2 \left(\frac{d\gamma}{dy} \right)^2 - V(\gamma) \right] \quad (6)$$

where

$$V(\gamma) = \cos[\gamma(y) - \alpha(y)] , \quad (7)$$

j_c is the critical current density, L is the thickness of the superconducting film in the direction normal to the plane of Fig. 2, and c is the speed of light. Also, $\lambda_J^2 = \Phi_0 c / (8\pi^2 d j_c)$ where $d \approx 2\lambda_L$ is the magnetic thickness of the grain boundary, λ_L being the London penetration depth. The quantity proportional to λ_J^2 represents the magnetic and surface current energy in the grain boundary. [4]

The free energy of Eq. (6) has the form of a Lagrangian describing the motion of a particle of mass λ_J^2 in a potential $V(\gamma)$; here γ represents the particle displacement, and y is time. Thus, it is clear that the condition for F to be a minimum is the equation of motion (1), where the force on the particle is $-\partial V / \partial \gamma = \sin(\gamma - \alpha)$. Since the particle velocity, $d\gamma/dy$, is proportional to the magnetic induction $h(y)$ in the junction, *i. e.*

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dy} = 4\pi\lambda_L h(y) / \Phi_0 , \quad (8)$$

it will be continuous across the twin boundaries where α changes by π ; also, since $d\gamma/dy$ is continuous, γ will also be continuous. This interpretation of Eq. (1) as describing the motion of a particle in a potential $V(\gamma)$ allow a simple intuitive description of the solutions of Eq. (1).

JOSEPHSON VORTICES

First consider the solution of Eq. 1 for $\alpha = 0$, *i. e.* no twin boundaries present. [3,4] There will be a solution corresponding to a particle starting at the potential maximum (point *a* of Fig. 3(a)) with zero velocity, accelerating down the hill to reach its maximum velocity at point *b*, and then gradually decelerating as it climbs the hill to come to rest again at point *c*. The corresponding graph of displacement versus time (or γ versus y) is shown in Fig. 3(b). The total change in γ of 2π gives a flux associated with this vortex of Φ_0 (recall $\Phi(y) = \Phi_0 \gamma(y) / (2\pi)$). Since the magnetic induction in the grain boundary is proportional to the particle velocity $d\gamma/dy$, it has its maximum value at the point $y = 0$ of Fig. 3(b). For this example, the solution $\gamma(y)$ and the free energy can be evaluated analytically. [4] The free energy of this vortex (relative to the state with $\gamma(y) = \text{constant} = 0$) is positive, which means that the vortex is not stable in the absence of an external magnetic field.

VORTEX WITH FLUX $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ TRAPPED BY A TWIN BOUNDARY

Now consider the case of Fig. 2(a) where the grain boundary is contacted by a single twin boundary at $y = 0$, and there are no other twin boundaries within a distance of many Josephson penetration depths λ_J . Here, $\alpha = 0$ for $y < 0$ and $\alpha = \pi$ for $y > 0$. The relevant potential is shown in Fig. 4(a), and the solution of interest corresponds to a particle starting at point *a* with zero velocity, accelerating down the hill to point *b*, decelerating up the hill from *b* and coming to rest at *c*. As noted above, the particle velocity is continuous at point *b*. The corresponding graph of γ as a function of y is shown in Fig. 4(b). The change of γ by π corresponds to the vortex containing a flux of $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$. This vortex is confined to be centred on the twin boundary, since moving the vortex away from the twin boundary will increase its free energy by an amount which, at large distances, is proportional to the distance it is displaced. It is also clear that the state with no vortex (*i. e.* $\gamma = \text{constant}$) is unstable with respect to the formation of the $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ vortex state.

A related problem is that in which there are an odd number of twin boundaries like the one in Fig. 2(a) which contact the grain boundary in a region $y_1 < y < y_2$, but where there are no changes of α (*i. e.* no twin boundaries) for several Josephson penetration depths for $y > y_2$ and $y < y_1$. In this case also, the state with no net flux in the region $y_1 < y < y_2$ will be unstable with respect to the formation of a state with a flux of $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ (states with flux $(n + \frac{1}{2})\Phi_0$, n an integer, are also possible).

PINNING OF A JOSEPHSON VORTEX

Suppose the grain boundary contains only two twin boundaries of the type shown in Fig. 2(a), and that these are separated by a distance $d \ll \lambda_J$. The appropriate potential is shown in Fig. 5. Again the particle begins at *a* with zero velocity, accelerates downhill, passes the points *b* and *c* corresponding to the location of the two twin boundaries, and eventually comes to rest at *d*. In passing point *b*, the phase α jumps by π ; because $d\gamma/dy$ must be continuous at *b*, the kinetic energy is continuous at *b*; the potential energy of the particle in the region from *b* to *c* is therefore taken

to be $C + \cos[\gamma(y) + \pi]$ where the constant C is chosen so that the potential energy, and hence the total energy, will be conserved when the particle passes point b . Because of the time the particle spends in the region from b to c , its free energy is lowered relative to what it would be in the absence of twin boundaries by an amount which is approximately $\Phi_0 j_c L d / (\pi c)$. This means that the vortex will be pinned by the region between the two twin boundaries.

RANDOM, CLOSELY-SPACED TWIN BOUNDARIES

Suppose the separation between twin boundaries is random and typically has a magnitude less than the Josephson penetration depth λ_J . Mannhart *et. al.* [1] have discussed a stochastic approach to the estimation of the variations of $\gamma(y)$ in this case, and have shown how a flux of Φ_0 can be spread out over a large distance (*i. e.* a distance of many times λ_J) as is observed in their experiments. This spreading out of the flux can also be understood in terms of the dynamical picture discussed above. Consider, for example, a particle beginning with zero velocity at a in the potential of Fig. 6 and accelerating downhill to b where it encounters a twin boundary; the particle then climbs from b to c ; at c the particle velocity goes to zero (the potential energy at c is the same as at a) and the particle then rolls back downhill past b , c and comes to f , where another twin boundary is encountered, and then continues towards g . It is seen that the particle can spend a lot of time rolling back and forward in the various potentials it encounters each time a twin boundary is crossed. This time is equivalent to distance measured along the twin boundary. This shows how a small amount of total flux can be spread out over a large distance.

CONCLUSION

The fundamental process which is at the origin of spontaneous flux generation in asymmetric 45° grain boundaries in the mechanism advanced in this paper is the stabilization of a vortex with flux $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ at points where a twin boundary such as that shown in Fig. 2(b) intersects a grain boundary. The existence of such half integral vortices is a consequence of the fact that the superconducting state of YBCO has odd symmetry with respect to a reflection in a twin boundary, and the observation of such vortices would thus constitute an experimental test of this odd reflection symmetry. Furthermore, this conclusion is independent of whether the A_{1g} orthorhombic-symmetry order parameter of YBCO is predominantly $d_{x^2-y^2}$ or s-wave.

In contrast to the above, the point where the twin boundary of Fig. 2(b) intersects the grain boundary should not support the existence of a vortex containing a flux of $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$. In this case, the assumption that the YBCO superconductivity is predominantly $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave has been combined with the assumption that the twin boundaries have odd reflection symmetry to arrive at this conclusion.

The fundamental process which is at the origin of spontaneous flux generation in the mechanism of Mannhart *et. al.* [1] and Moler *et. al.* [2] is the stabilization of a vortex with a flux of $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ at the vertex b in Fig. 1 of the intersection of two distinct facets of a grain boundary. It is possible that both the faceting mechanism and the twin boundary mechanism play a role in grain boundaries studied in Ref. [1] and [2].

Although the materials and sample preparation problems are no doubt formidable, it would be of interest to prepare samples having isolated twin boundaries, and an isolated intersection of two facets [such as shown in Figs 1 and 2(a) and (b)] and to observe directly the presence or absence of vortices with a flux of $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ in these idealized cases. The superconductor on the right hand side of Figs. 1 and 2(a), and on the left of Fig. 2(b), does not necessarily have to be YBCO, but could be an isotropic superconductor such as lead.

An interesting special case of the faceting mechanism for the stabilization of a $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ vortex occurs in the corner junction such as that used in Ref. [13]. To obtain the $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$ vortex, the junction would have to be long in comparison with the Josephson penetration depth. The actual experimental conditions of Ref. [13] correspond to the short junction case.

Note also that in c-axis tunneling from a twinned crystal of YBCO to Pb (as in Ref. [16]) the Josephson junctions formed by the two different types of twins must be, one a π junction and the other a normal junction (see Ref. [5]). Thus, a necessary condition for spontaneous flux generation is satisfied here also. For example, for a YBCO crystal which consists of only two twins, a vortex containing a half a flux quantum would form along the line where the plane containing the single twin boundary contacts the junction. The fact that the junctions [16] are "fabricated on a broad surface normal to the c axis" however means that the normal and π junctions are distributed over a two-dimensional surface. This is different from the situation of Refs. [1,2] where the normal and π junctions are distributed along a one-dimensional grain boundary.

The degree of orthorhombicity of the superconductivity of YBCO plays a role in the mechanisms just described. For example, for a tetragonal $d_{x^2-y^2}$ superconductor, the critical current for an ideal asymmetric 45° twin boundary

(such as oo' in Fig. 1) is zero, and the critical currents on the grain boundary facets ab and bc have opposite signs. For a superconductor which has some orthorhombicity but is nevertheless approximately $d_{x^2-y^2}$, the critical current on oo' of Fig. 1 is not zero, and the angle δ (or δ') will have to exceed some nonzero critical value in order for the critical currents of the two facets to have opposite signs. Similarly, some orthorhombicity is necessary for the critical current not to be zero on the grain boundaries of Fig. 2.

One measure of the degree of orthorhombicity of the superconductivity in YBCO, is the ratio of the penetration depths, λ_a/λ_b , measured along the crystallographic a and b directions, in untwinned single crystals. [17,18] This ratio is approximately 1.5 to 2.0 in high quality crystals [17] thus indicating a considerable degree of superconducting orthorhombicity. The result $\lambda_a/\lambda_b \sim 1$ obtained in an earlier measurement [19] has been attributed [17] to the presence of disorder in the CuO chains. Since the degree of orthorhombicity appears to depend on crystal quality, and since the orientation δ of the grain boundary (see Fig. 1) at which the critical Josephson current vanishes is also a measure of the orthorhombicity, the crystal quality is expected to play some role in the detailed understanding of spontaneous flux generation in asymmetric 45° grain boundaries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank J.R. Kirtley for a stimulating discussion of the results of Refs. [1] and [2] and for prepublication copies of these references, and to acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

-
- [1] J. Mannhart, H. Hilgenkamp, B. Mayer, Ch. Gerber, J.R. Kirtley, K.A. Moler and M. Sigrist, preprint.
 - [2] K.A. Moler, J.R. Kirtley, J. Mannhart, H. Hilgenkamp, B. Mayer, Ch. Gerber, Ruixing Liang, Douglas A. Bonn and Walter N. Hardy, to be published in Conference Proceedings of 10th Anniversary HTS Workshop on Physics, Materials and Applications, Houston, Texas, March 12–16, 1996.
 - [3] R. Ferrell and R. Prange, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 479 (1963).
 - [4] B.D. Josephson, Adv. Phys. **14**, 419 (1965).
 - [5] M.B. Walker, Phys. Rev. **B53**, 5835 (1996).
 - [6] M.B. Walker and J. Luettmmer-Strathmann, to be published in Phys. Rev. **B**, July 1, 1996.
 - [7] V.B. Geshkenbein and A.I. Larkin, Phys. Rev. **B 36**, 235 (1987).
 - [8] J.R. Kirtley, C.C. Tsuei, Martin Rupp, J.Z. Sun, Lock See Yu-Jahnes, A. Gupta, and M.B. Ketchen, Phys. Rev. Lett., in press.
 - [9] C.C. Tsuei, J.R. Kirtley, M. Rupp, J.Z. Sun, A. Gupta, M.B. Ketchen, C.A. Wang, Z.F. Ren, J.H. Wang, and M. Bushan, Science **271**, 329 (1996).
 - [10] A.F. Andreev, JETP Lett. **46**, 584 (1987).
 - [11] D.A. Wollman, D.J. Van Harlingen, W.C. Lee, D.M. Ginsberg, and A.J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2134 (1993).
 - [12] A. Mathai, Y. Gim, R.C. Black, A. Amar, and F.C. Wellstood, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4523 (1995).
 - [13] D.A. Wollman, D.J. Van Harlingen, J. Giapinzakis, and D.M. Ginsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 797 (1995).
 - [14] C.C. Tsuei, J.R. Kirtley, C.C. Chi, L.S. Yu-Jahnes, A. Gupta, T. Shaw, J.Z. Sun, and M.B. Ketchen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 593 (1994).
 - [15] M. Sigrist and T.M. Rice, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **61**, 4283 (1992).
 - [16] A.G. Sun, D.A. Gajewski, M.B. Maple, and R.C. Dynes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2267 (1994).
 - [17] D.N. Basov, R. Liang, D.A. Bonn, W.N. Hardy, B. Dabrowski, M. Quijada, D.B. Tanner, J.P. Rice, D.M. Ginsberg, and T. Timusk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 598 (1995).
 - [18] A.G. Sun, S.H. Han, A.S. Katz, D.A. Gajewski, M.B. Maple, and R.C. Dynes, Phys. Rev. **B52**, 15731 (1995).
 - [19] Z. Schlesinger, R.T. Collins, F. Holtzberg, C. Feild, S.H. Blanton, U. Welp, G.W. Crabtree, Y. Fang, and J.Z. Liu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 801 (1990).

FIG. 1. Two tetragonal $d_{x^2-y^2}$ superconductors with their a and b axes in the plane of the figure but oriented at 45° degrees relative to each other are shown schematically. The two superconductor are on either side of a grain boundary. The dashed line oo' represents an ideal straight asymmetric 45° grain boundary, whereas the solid lines ab and bc represent two facets of a grain boundary which are rotated by angles of δ and δ' relative to the ideal case.

FIG. 2. (a) and (b) The two ways in which twin boundaries can end at a grain boundary. The directions of the crystallographic a and b axes in the different regions are indicated by the rectangles.

FIG. 3. (a) The dynamical potential $V(\gamma)$ appropriate for the description of a Josephson vortex. (b) Qualitative behavior of the gauge invariant phase γ as a function of the distance y along the grain boundary for the Josephson vortex.

FIG. 4. (a) The dynamical potential $V(\gamma)$ appropriate for the description of a vortex containing a flux $\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0$. (b) The gauge invariant phase γ for this vortex. The origin $y = 0$ is the location of a twin boundary of the type shown in Fig. 2(a).

FIG. 5. The dynamical potential describing a Josephson vortex pinned by a pair of neighboring twin boundaries. The changes in slope of the potential at b and c are due to the twin boundaries.

FIG. 6. Dynamical potential for which twin boundaries are encountered at points b and f .











